UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese } ***Associate Editors***

Germany—Then and Now

Part I.

By Edwin D. Mead

The Passing of Parliaments—An Editorial— . . . . . *Joseph Ernest McAfee*

Jesus and Marx . . . . . *Sydney Strong*

War, Imperialism and the Social Revolution . . . . . *Reginald A. Reynolds*

Book Reviews . . . . *Frederick Starr and Robert C. Schaller*

VOLUME CXI NUMBER 10

Chicago, May 8, 1933

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter July 30, 1931, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
LOUIS L. MANN, CURTIS W. REESE, *Associate Editors*

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
M. C. OTTO
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 151
The Passing of Parliaments—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 153
Jottings—J. H. H 155
ARTICLES—
Germany—Then and Now. I—EDWIN D. MEAD 156
Jesus and Marx—SYDNEY STRONG 158
POETRY—
The Prayer of the Knights of Peace—*Attributed to Francis of Assisi* 151
The Hitler Horror:
I. In Germany—STANTON A. COBLENTZ 163
II. Again the Dark Ages—LUCIA TRENT 163
III. Defeat the Hitlers Everywhere—RALPH CHEYNEY .. 163
THE STUDY TABLE—
New Books—FREDERICK STARR 160
An American Warlord—ROBERT C. SCHALLER 162
CORRESPONDENCE—
Secretaries of the Navy and Disarmament—BRADLEY STONE ... 162
A National Financial and Industrial Emergency—W. P. CALKINS 163
THE FIELD—
War, Imperialism and the Social Revolution—REGINALD A. REYNOLDS 150

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

War, Imperialism and the Social Revolution

[FROM OUR SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT]

Imperialism is recognized today by all scientific Socialists as the cause of international war. Begun by buccaneers in pursuit of plunder, it has developed into a struggle for the control of markets, raw materials and jobs for the governing classes of the industrial countries.

The growth of imperialism has been accompanied not only by wars fought between empire builders and native peoples but by fierce struggles between rival capitalist groups. After the decline of Spain, Great Britain and France were the principal contestants, and Franco-British wars up to the time of Waterloo were fought mainly to determine the future of India and Canada. The victory of British imperialism in this struggle turned the attention of our capitalists to the consolidation of their gains; and the nineteenth century was mainly occupied in a less ostentatious, but peculiarly bloody, "penetration" of colonial hinterland and the more systematic subjection of native peoples.

The road to India having been secured by bolstering up the Ottoman government against the new menace of Russian imperialism (as, for example, in the Crimean War) and by the occupation of Egypt, there began a series of snatch and grab raids in South Africa not unlike that which has been taking place in Kenya. In these, British bandits and Dutch slave-gangers fought for the right to rob and enslave the Negro. Today by a gentleman's agreement they do this fairly amicably together.

The Great War was in the main an effort on the part of German imperialism to find a "place in the sun" when that place was already occupied by those who had started earlier in the race. British Liberals smiled benignly upon a world already painted red (British Imperial red —not Russian!) and did not understand why everyone was not happy with what he had got. . . . They thanked God for the largest fleet in the world (a necessity, with all those red spots on the map to defend) and they did not understand why German imperialists tried feverishly to catch up with them. They pointed out that if only everyone would be content with a smaller fleet than they had themselves, there would be peace: because no one else would be tempted to fight; and they did not want to fight themselves as they had all they wanted at the moment, and were quite happy. . . .

However, as the German imperialists insisted upon being like our own, the war came. Today Japan stands roughly where Germany then stood in the international tangle. To the southeast a population half the size of London holds to a policy of "White Australia" and with the protection of the British fleet keeps an undeveloped continent against Asiatic colonization. The United States dominates the American continent and challenges

(*Continued on page* 164)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXI MONDAY, MAY 8, 1933 Number 10

THE PRAYER OF THE KNIGHTS OF PEACE

Lord, make of me an instrument of thy peace!
Where hate rules, let me bring love;
Where malice, forgiveness;
Where disputes, reconciliation;
Where error, truth;
Where doubt, belief;
Where despair, hope;
Where darkness, thy light;
Where sorrow, joy!
Oh Master, let me strive more to comfort others than to be comforted myself, to understand others than to be understood myself,
To love others more than to be loved!
For he who gives, receives;
He who forgets himself, finds;
He who forgives, receives forgiveness,
And dying we may rise again to eternal life!

—Attributed to Francis of Assisi.

The announcement of the Five-Power Alliance in Europe—France, Poland, and the Little Entente (Roumania, Czecho-Slovakia, and Jugo-Slavia)—is pretty terrible news for anybody who loves and hopes for peace. As a direct and immediate response to the Mussolini-MacDonald projected Four-Power Pact (England, France, Italy, and Germany), it is sad commentary on the statesmanship of the British Prime Minister and the usefulness of his globe-trotting expeditions to Geneva, Rome, and Washington. Of course, the Four-Power proposal was dead before it was born—France saw to that! But meanwhile it has done its ghastly work in aligning these pestiferous French underlings in a solid phalanx of opposition to the revision of the Versailles Treaty, or to any change in the calamitous *status quo* in Europe. If we add to this event, the Hitler menace, the British-Russian embroilment, and the Polish Corridor difficulty now festering to a running sore, it is not altogether surprising, to say the least, that the Geneva Disarmament conference has at last thrown up its hands in despair and all but abandoned its hopeless job. What we are seeing these days in the international field is not only the collapse of all our hopes for an unarmed and peaceful world in the future, but also the immediately impending collapse of all that structure of peace which has been so laboriously built up since the War. The League of Nation's action in the China-Japanese affair brought in the end great credit and genuine prestige to that organization. The World Court's decision in the Greenland dispute was an almost perfect illustration of the effectiveness of the judicial process for settling international disputes. How can the Senate delay taking the United States into the Court in the face of such an achievement as this? But meanwhile the vast tide of world militarism sweeps on upon its brutal way. The flood is not yet released—war has not come! But if there is any effort that can avail to bring mankind to sanity, it should not be spared now.

Premier MacDonald gave a peculiar, an almost pathetic explanation of his visit to this country. He said that just as he came here in 1929 to join President Hoover in accomplishing military disarmament, so he had now come to join President Roosevelt in accomplishing economic disarmament. We marvel that the astute British statesman did not foresee the obvious retort—that if he does not succeed better with this project of economic disarmament than he did with the earlier project of military disarmament, the outlook for the world is pretty terrible. Or is it that MacDonald does not see the utter futility of his international statesmanship? This would seem to be a part of the insufferable egotism by which he has lately been stricken. But we prefer to think that he is simply a conscientious and desperately worried man who is willing, in spite of past failures, to try again, and still again, in any hope that something may be done to save our sorely stricken society before it is too late. At any rate, the Premier's visit to this country was a gallant gesture, and Mr. Roosevelt's endeavor to advise with him and with Mr. Herriot and with other European statesmen, an action to stir the heart. In spite of repeated disappointments in the past, we believe that there is nothing but good in these international parleys between responsible men; and we still hope, incurable optimists that we are, that some day to our vast surprise something definite and decisive may be accomplished. Certainly the record of postponement, delay, defeat is long enough. Certainly also the crisis at this hour is portentous enough. If ever there was a time for agreement upon sweeping reforms—disarmament, lowered tariffs, currency accord—this is it. Yet we cannot forget that behind these well-intentioned and earnest men there are coun-

tries still self-centered and intensely nationalistic—and all around these countries fierce forces of discord and disruption of well-nigh incalculable power. What can these men, or any men, really do. But

". . . they *must*—and so they dare."

We take it for granted that we are nothing but an ignoramus in financial and economic matters. What we think, therefore, on such questions is of little importance. But confession of ignorance is good, if only for the instruction which it invites. So we want to confess herewith that we simply cannot understand what is meant by all this talk about raising commodity prices. There can be no end to the depression, we are told, until these prices are brought back to something of their old-time level. But why? Because, we are patiently told, farmers will not produce, factory owners will not manufacture, business will not begin anew, until prices are high enough to provide a profit. O, a *profit?* So that's what we're after in this matter of raising commodity prices? We are trying to get the old broken-down profit system on its feet again, so that the farmers and manufacturers, bankers and brokers, can once again prosper at the game of exploiting the people! A lower commodity price, the lowest possible, is good for the buyer, obviously. But who cares anything about the buyer in our society. The man who purchases is the victim—the one to be gouged, robbed, stripped naked, at the highest price the market will bear, so that the owners of raw materials and machinery, and the endless middle men, may roll in wealth again. In other words, we must boost prices to the old level, so that we may go back to those hectic days of unprecedented buying and selling at unimaginable profits—which brought us in the end to precisely where we are today! What all this talk about commodity prices really means, as we have said, is that our leaders have no other idea of curing things than that of reestablishing the profit system. They are trying with desperate exertion to "put Humpty-Dumpty back again." But it can't be done! If it could be done, it ought not to be done! The only sure cure of present ills is the abandonment of the price system altogether, and the substitution of use for profit. The Technocrats see this—and so do the Socialists!

The business of deceiving ourselves with false phrases goes on apace. Indeed, the reluctance to face reality promises something like a new language. New phrases are feverishly displacing old in a desperate endeavor to help us escape from seeing things as they really are. This process began in the Great War when the barbarism of conscription was concealed under the fine phrase, *"selective service."* It went on into the peace, when colonies were no longer "colonies" but suddenly became *"mandatories."* The veterans caught the habit when they demanded not a "bonus" but *"adjusted compensation."* Now that the crisis of the depression is upon us, and apparently we cannot live without fooling ourselves, this practice of inventing new language to cover old disasters is becoming something like a mania. Thus, when a bank "busts," it goes into the hands not of a "receiver" but of a *"conservator."* When all the banks "bust" and nations default, the crisis is called a *"moratorium."* When bonds cannot be paid, they are *"refinanced."* Interest is called *"debt service,"* non-payment of debts *"stabilization of the currency,"* bad debts *"frozen assets,"* inflation *"reflation."* Money shoveled out to banks, railroads, corporations, without the slightest chance, or even honest expectation, of repayment, is described by the charming word, *"loans."* Japan invades China, fights Chinese armies, destroys Chinese cities, conquers Chinese territory—and it's not a war at all, but only *"enforcement of peace."* It's a great old game—this sport of altered nomenclature. We play it ardently as both the swindler and the swindled. But what nonsense it is at bottom! Why should we think that names and phrases make any difference? Things, after all, have a stubborn way of being and remaining what they are. Actions have a similarly stubborn way of reaping their appointed consequences, no matter how gaudily they be arrayed in masquerade. Our sober conviction is that the first law of health, mental and spiritual, is to be honest with one's self and with the world. And surely first obedience to this law means using words in their primary and fundamental meaning.

It was years ago that Arthur Balfour said, "We know too much about matter to be materialists." Professor J. T Haldane, in his new book, "Materialism," declares his conviction that the materialistic interpretation of phenomena is utterly inadequate, and that only a "spiritual interpretation" can meet the facts. But Dr. George W. Crile, of Cleveland, doesn't think so! In his recent address at New York University, this distinguished physician undertook to revive the old nineteenth century materialism in its crassest and crudest form. His argument was made all the more striking (the New York *Times* published it on the front page!) by reason of the fact that it dealt with mental phenomena. "The mind," said Dr. Crile, "is solely a product of electricity generated by matter." His laboratory investigations showed conclusively, he went on, that the brain emits short-wave and infra-red radiations; these radiations cause the ejection of electrons from the brain protoplasm; and these electrons in turn set up the electric current responsible for all our thinking and reasoning processes. Why, this electric current can be *measured*—a fact which, to scientists of a

certain type, explains everything! "The dynamics of the brain," summed up Dr. Crile, "seem to parallel the dynamics of the energy processes of non-living mechanisms, such as the internal combustion engine or an electric battery." Interesting—especially that pregnant phrase, "seem to parallel!" Our scientist is obviously dealing with the old-time fallacy that similarity is equivalent to identity. But if Dr. Crile really wants to prove his case for materialism, why doesn't he do the very simple last thing that remains to be done? Our mental processes, he says, resemble and therefore are the same as the processes of "the internal combustion engine or an electric battery." All right! Now let the good doctor build and operate an engine which will produce a Shelley's "Sky-Lark." Let him give us a battery which will turn out a Beethoven's Fifth Symphony. Or—to make the experiment easy! —let him give us any kind of a machine which will write a paper to be read by Dr. George W. Crile at New York University.

The capacity of man to rise above defeat is what has been called the eternal resilience of the human race. It is Browning's

> Never dreamed, though right were worsted, wrong would triumph
> Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better,
> Sleep to wake.

Some of us, it is true, are broken and beaten, but our inspiration comes from those who meet disaster with a smile and take even defeat as one of life's great jokes. It is this power in mankind to rise with the joy of struggle surging within him that gives to the race the quality of nobility. We are frustrated, but in rising above our frustrations we reveal the values which men have called, from time immemorial, eternal. Isaiah cried, "The grass withereth and the flower fadeth, but the word of God shall endure forever." The ideal illumined by "the light that never was on sea or land" has been and is to men "the word of God." These are strenuous times. They try the souls of men. But that which inspires us and stimulates our faith is the brave, courageous, and even cheerful way in which people today meet disaster. With such a spirit in us we cannot know defeat.

The Passing of Parliaments

It is impossible to say what will happen next in Washington. The publicists there predict a break between the President and the Congress. Before this is printed the break may have come, or, at any rate, a lapse in the docility with which Congress has put through measures recommended by the new administration.

But we ought to be looking deeper. Should Congress re-assert its time-honored "dignity"? Has Congress been too pliant? Has it now a duty to put a crimp in the "dictatorship" which the Executive has assumed? Are we witnessing the debacle of democracy? Should warning voices be raised to save sacred traditions of popular government?

Questions like these are now being pressed by liberals and radicals and progressives and those of various names and professions who feel that they have been ordained to protect the holy ark of democracy. May I be permitted to lift a voice of warning against the warning? The shoe is on the other foot. Democracy is having a good time, one of the best of its times. The sacred ark is not even shaking, but is riding along towards its goal swiftly and with a security which justifies progressives in speeding it on its way.

We are witnessing new evidences of the breakdown of parliamentarism, but there should be nothing in that spectacle to surprise the discerning student of the past hundred years. The destinies of democracy are not bound up in parliaments and legislatures and congresses. Indeed, it would more squarely hit the point to say that those destinies are bound up in an emancipation from parliamentary shackles. If we are tired already of the brief season of having the will of the people expressed in government, and wish to return to our perennial muddling, then it is time, to be sure, for Congress to assert its traditional propensity to block the people's will and mess up the public business. That has been the chief function of legislatures and congresses throughout the memory of those now living: blocking progress and messing things up.

The progressive has been ready enough to criticize Congress during many years past. What has justified such criticism? The personnel of the body? That is unreasonable. For the most part Congressmen are hard-working gentlemen, and they are thoroughly "representative" in character and general intelligence. It is time we directed our criticism intelligently. The trouble with Congress is not the crookedness or stodginess of Messrs. A, B, and C, who make up its rolls; its bane is that it is Congress. It is a great, groaning, creaking blunder-bund, which came lumbering into our age along with the stage-coach. The latter we have relegated to the museum, while we are still trying to use Congress in doing the public business.

It is the actual fact that Congress came in with the stage-coach. It was designed precisely to fit the times when the stage-coach was the standard means of rapid transit. It was devised to supply a medium by which democracy could function after a fashion against

the almost insuperable odds of isolation and popular ignorance. The people had no means of expressing their will, or even forming an intelligent judgment upon governmental questions, and the nearest approach possible was the delegation of their powers to authorized "representatives." Congresses and legislatures are a concession that distance and poor roads are too much for democracy. And in maintaining them now we show that we have not awakened to the significance of good roads, facile inter-communication and annihilated space.

Where in the modern world are these outworn implements of popular government not breaking down? What has happened in the land of the Mother of Parliaments? The government of Britain is today most occupied with concealing its real purposes lest it shall suffer incorrigible parliamentary interference. On the European continent one people after another is complacently permitting its parliament to be swept into the discard, or reduced to such impotence that few real statesmen will retain membership. On much of this continent one revolution succeeds another so rapidly that if Mark Twain were still alive he would be calling for belts and pulleys to gear the whirring wheels to his sewing machine. And surely no one can intelligently desire a lapse into our conventional rounds of talk, talk, talk, down in Washington. The country has been so pleased by a little action in the public interest that a resumption of the time-honored congressional talk-fest is likely to precipitate popular revolt.

The truth is that we are all inclined to cry out in the name of democracy whenever things are not going our way. Many of us have good reason to know that, at least on occasions, we belong to a minority. What we want is not always what the people want. I am frank to say that affairs are not going in all particulars as I should like to have them go, but I cannot recall a time when the people were getting more nearly and more promptly what they want. Legislation enacted and proposed under the new administration is following directly the outlines of the Democratic party platform, for which some twenty millions of Americans voted, the largest number who ever recorded their will for one set of policies at one time.

Personally I consider the farm relief measure a gigantic jest. The President himself wonders if it will work, and proposes to try something else if it doesn't. Personally, again, I consider the beer law an outrage, and the repeal amendment an abomination. But, in forming and expressing these views, I know that I am not asserting the present will of the American democracy. I am rather asserting my individual or my group's right to differ from the majority. Yet I am a good enough democrat to applaud the thorough-going and prompt manner in which the majority is having its will expressed in law. Could this result have been achieved by an unregulated Congress? It is idle even to imagine such a thing. The only way in which to achieve such results through Congress is to do just what has been done, namely, reduce it to the status of a rubber stamp under the administration's hand, to shut it away for the time from the clamoring lobbies which represent self-seeking minorities, and give a free hand to an organization which will fulfil definite instructions from the electorate.

It seems to me most important that we should recognize just what is the matter with Congress. As already remarked, the trouble is it is *Congress*. There it is, deeply embedded in our political mechanism. It will be a Herculean task to get rid of it, or even to transform it into something not now itself. In the meantime, we are getting around it, shunting it to one side, encysting it like a dry tumor in the body politic. We are resorting to all kinds of measures to reduce its worst evils. Interestingly enough, some of these are now emanating from the legislative bodies themselves. A national association of legislators has recently been formed. Committees are already at work on measures designed more securely to lodge power with small groups in the legislatures, and to utilize experts, not members of the official body, in doing the real work of legislation.

Popular movements by way of getting rid of legislatures and congress are following two main lines. One is now graphically depicted in Washington. Contemplate the transformation which has taken place in the national executive department! How radically different is the Presidential office today from that written into the constitution, and intended by the framing fathers! And the tendency from the start has been steadily in the direction of the goal at which we are arriving.

We now have the presidential candidates' names on the ballot. This is the much-desired short ballot in its best form. The vesting of power in the office has more than kept pace with the focalizing of the popular will in the choice of the officer. The same tendency is to be detected throughout our political system: put some one in office and give him power to make good his responsibility. So general is this tendency that there can be no question that the new conception of the Presidency is but an expression of the will of the people; here is democracy clear and confident.

The other tendency, by way of doing away with legislatures, is revealed in progressive city government. In hundreds of American cities the system which makes a legislature central has been swept away. Both legislative and administrative responsibility are concentrated in a single commission, small, manageable, readily observable by all, and vested with complete power to make good. There seems no good reason to

question that this will be the standard form of American city government henceforth. Movements are now forward in several states to apply the same system in county government, and in a few there is responsible discussion of it for government of the state itself.

At this point tendency number two coming up meets tendency number one going down: several states are following the course indicated at Washington. They are concentrating attention upon the Governor's office, and are giving it supremacy over the legislature. The most notable recent illustration is that of Indiana, where Governor McNutt has set a pace even for the President in measures of governmental re-organization.

In either case, democracy stands to gain. The simplification of governmental machinery and the concentration of governmental authority are moves in the direction of truer and freer democracy, not in the contrary direction, as is so often believed. Every manifestation of this tendency is sure to be scorned by some as dictatorship. Confusion and muddling, and a welter of public officials involved in the mess, appear to be the stigmata of democracy in the conception of these judges. The facts point in quite the opposite direction. Democracy will win new advantages whichever one of the two tendencies noted shall prevail. The progressive citizen can afford to be almost indifferent as to which shall finally dominate American government. Perhaps it will be found that one method suits one group of political organizations, and the other fits better in other situations.

The present point is that whichever prevails, legislatures and congresses and parliaments are bound to be discarded, as instruments of practical government. Conventions and mass conferences are a fixture in democratic procedure. They serve a very useful purpose. But every frequenter of these conclaves knows how impotent they are when there is need of getting things done. They are efficient in passing resolutions, but in achieving practical social effects a child is more able. Government, we Americans are learning, is not confabulation and voting that somebody ought to do something. Legislatures are exceedingly competent in staging talk-fests, but crises like the present make painful demonstration of their impotence.

We have yet to learn the essential limitations of law-making. Drastic reformers have proposed a moratorium for law-making bodies. They would send legislatures home, and lock legislative chambers for a good decade, while we sweat out of the body politic the excessive legislation which now surfeits us. We certainly need many fewer laws than we now have, and the whole process of law-making needs to be minimized. The necessary residuum should be turned over to experts, who will make short work of the business, and will eliminate the muddling and wire-pulling and slick finesse which are now the standard technique of legislators. It does not require our present lumbering legislative machinery to express the people's will, even on paper, and when it is considered that turning out paper soiled with their blundering is about the limit of the legislatures' functions in government, their grotesque ineconomy is glaring.

Again, the issue is not the personnel of Congress and legislatures, nor the fidelity of the members to their assigned task. The issue is the organization itself, the perpetuation into our age, distinguished by free communication and rapid transit, of institutions designed and built for the age of our stage-coach-riding and pedestrian great-grand-parents. In the name of all that is democratic let us quit loading our democratic procedure with all this legislative trumpery. Least of all should we bow down and worship as at the shrine of democracy.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

Jottings

"America Goes Off the Gold Standard."
Newspaper Headline (April 20, 1933).

At last, after thirty-seven years, William Jennings Bryan is justified!

As we read the daily news from Washington, we keep thinking of—what? A whirling dervish we saw in the East, spinning 'round and 'round with furious energy, never moving an inch from the spot where he started, and digging down deeper all the time into the ground.

The German Nazis declare that they are Socialist, but not Marxist. This sounds like the Church, which is Christ-ian, but not Jesus-ian.

On news that the winter wheat crop would be the scantiest in twenty-nine years, owing to bad weather and prevailingly unfavorable conditions, the Stock Exchange bounded up several points. This was the best news that had been received in the markets for a long time! We suppose that the news would have been simply perfect if nature had refused to produce at all, and there had been no wheat. To such a pass has our economic system come!

"Last heath hen believed dead. Sole survivor of

the once abundant species vanishes." Thus runs the tragic story in the New York *Times*. In due course we shall expect to read in the same paper something like the following:

"Last taxpayer believed dead. Sole survivor of the once abundant species vanishes."

If We Were a Newspaper Editor: (4) *We would recognize that labor news is as important as society news,* and might have a million more readers.

J. H. H.

Germany—Then and Now

I

In the winter of 1807-8, when Germany lay crushed at the feet of Napoleon after the battle of Jena, while Berlin itself was still occupied by French troops, Fichte from his academic chair in Berlin delivered his uplifting and now famous Addresses to the German People. His own voice was often drowned by the French trumpets in the street; but although the French Commander had threatened with vengeance any who should speak or write upon the political state of Germany, and although there were frequently spies in his audience, he pushed steadily on through the dozen lectures unmolested. He realized his danger, but faced it and delivered his message. It was not a message of lament, it was not a message of defiance, it was not the boasting of a braggart. He did not plead for "a nationalist and martial state." He did not raise the slogan, "No honor without battle," as was done the other day at Potsdam. He looked forward, not back, and strove to lift his hearers and the German people to a vision of the great new era which he believed was opening for the world and in which Germany might play so great a part. With a lofty and not a petty and petulant patriotism, and with prophetic inspiration, he sought to erect his country's future welfare on a deeper national life, the dignity of spiritual freedom, and the commanding sense of the nation's relation to mankind. It was at bottom and almost throughout an impassioned plea for a new education for the redemption of his country and of the world. He was at the same moment working out the program of this new education in connection with the founding of the new University of Berlin, of which he was made the first rector, and which thus came to birth at that fateful hour.

His powerful patron and collaborator was Prussia's great minister, Baron von Stein, greatest of all German statesmen before Bismarck, and first to catch the real vision of a united Germany. After a previous unhappy experience with the king, Stein had been called back to the head of the government in its desperate plight, and took office in October, 1807. No one else has told the story of his transforming achievements so well as the English Seeley. Stein had a peculiarly English mind, was early a careful student of English political institutions, and the effects of these studies appear in many of his later policies at Berlin. His cardinal aim was the conversion of an absolute government into a free representative state—the exact antithesis of the purpose which dominates Berlin today; and he saw that the only hope of salvation lay in the people themselves, in the raising of their moral tone and their rousing to a real interest in governing themselves.

This glance backward to the hour, an hour of bitter national humiliation, of Fichte's mighty appeal to the German people, and especially to the inspiration of youth, and a glance at Germany today, present a sad and startling contrast. In the present yet more serious crisis, Germany has no Fichte and no minor prophet with Fichte's spirit who makes his voice heard in the degradation and confusion. The occasion which demands a super-Stein finds at the helm a pinchbeck Mussolini.

Germany has never witnessed a sadder spectacle than that of the aged Hindenburg accompanying Hitler to the old garrison church at Potsdam, where Frederick the Great is buried, saluting there the invited Hohenzollerns, and, with ceremonies of an almost religious solemnity, hailing the accession of Hitler to the chancellorship as the signal for "a national rebirth of the soul for the weal of a unified, free and proud Germany." Thousands of Nazi troops, amidst the boom of cannon, tramped up and down before the church, within which the members of the Reichstag, with a suitable sprinkling of generals and admirals, witnessed the proceedings; at night bonfires blazed on the hills; and in Berlin throngs of Nazi youths paraded the streets singing their battle song:

> When hand grenades burst all around,
> Our hearts' contentment knows no bound.

The president of the new Reichstag, in opening its session in the evening, still lurid with the fires of the Potsdam morning, exclaimed, "The spirit of Weimar is dead; the spirit of Potsdam lives, and Germany guided by the Potsdam spirit will ride to new glory." The Weimar constitution and the republic came in for further slaps from Hitler and his lieutenants as the week went on. They know well that President von Hindenburg holds his power under that constitution, to which he has repeatedly sworn allegiance and to which hitherto he has been faithful. How his sanction of dictatorial power to Hitler for four years can be made to comport with this in his eyes it is hard at this distance to understand. But the old Field Marshal is worn out; and although it is with averted eyes that we consider the performance in the old Potsdam church, we do not here feel like casting stones at him. It has been chiefly his stalwart arm and stalwart spirit which have thus far carried Germany through her revolution; and if he does not now resign, we believe that it is because he feels he may yet render an imperative service to the Fatherland if the Hitler excesses run beyond the bounds of decency.

What is in the minds of those Berlin adventurers as they repair to the Potsdam garrison-church for this consecration service, and in one breath talk of "the Potsdam spirit" and "the rebirth of the German soul"? Has "the German soul" ever hovered about Potsdam in the past? Was it there in the time of Frederick the Second or of William the Second? Frederick did not even respect the German speech, he flouted it as

the language of boors, and never used it in conversation if there was any available man with whom he could talk French; although he did in his later life (in an essay written in French) predict that German literature had a great future. He was utterly indifferent to the new tide of German intellectual life rising all around him. He thought Goethe's *Götz von Berlichingen* a vulgar imitation of vulgar English models. He was probably not half conscious that Kant and Lessing were his contemporaries, although Lessing in his youth had written an ode in his honor; and he once declined to give Lessing some small librarianship which Lessing, or his friends for him, had asked for. As for religion, he had none. He was not an atheist; he believed in some sort of a *demiurgus* who probably created the world. But God, however called, took no interest in human affairs—for which view, in consideration of the human affairs with which he chiefly had to do, there was certainly some warrant. Human affairs generally were not to him imposing. When a school inspector expatiated to him on men's betterment and growing inclination to good, he rejoined, "Ah, you don't know this damned race!"

In whom was the real "soul of Germany" incarnate in that Eighteenth Century? Was it in the lord of "Sans Souci," or was it in the international Lessing and the international Kant—Kant with his great vision of Eternal Peace; Lessing to whom world history was the continuous process of the education of the human race? At this moment, when "the Potsdam spirit" is pushing the ascendant Berlin politicians into reversion to race animosity and race proscription, we cannot fail to remember that Lessing's honored friend was the Jew, Moses Mendelssohn, and the hero of his greatest drama was Nathan the Wise.

It is a noteworthy thing that the most memorable work on Frederick should be not by a German but by Carlyle, who devoted to the subject more volumes and more years than he ever devoted to anything else. He was moved to it alike by his love for Germany, and his almost professional passion for hero-worship. It is an imposing monument of research and thoroughness. But at the close of all the long and weary years, Carlyle mournfully confessed that the time and effort had been wasted, as the more he studied Frederick and the better he came to know him, the less of a hero he found him.

As to his wars—and he was the most brilliant and successful warrior of his time, and this is what the idolaters of "the Potsdam spirit" care about—there was not one of them undertaken or pursued for any high moral purpose. He laid no claims to lofty motives. Of his early war for the possession of Silesia he candidly confessed that "it was a means of acquiring reputation and increasing the power of the state." His alliance with Russia, with a view to the partition of Poland, which partition appears to have been first suggested by Frederick himself, was a shameful affair, the partition a gross violation even of such international law as then existed. The motive for it was simply to strengthen Prussia and enlarge her domain. No American and no enlightened man would defend the details of the Polish Corridor, much less the flagrant injustice to the Germans in Upper Silesia, following the World War; and the attempt to right century-old wrongs generally leads to more wrong than right. But we may not overlook the fact that those mischiefs and confusions are in high degree belated penalties of the arbitrary courses of Frederick the Great a century and a half before.

That certainly is not the whole story. If it was a good thing that a strong Prussia should come into existence in Europe to offset and check the menacing ambitions and the conscienceless policies of Austria, then most men will wink at courses compared with which opposing courses were worse. However bad his start, Frederick at last was fighting for his life and for the life of his country, a country that had in it such mighty potentialities and belonged to the morning and not to the night. He was moreover a veritable human being, with many kinds of genius besides military genius; while the phalanx of those who hemmed him in and blocked him was mainly made up of insufferably dull survivals. Most of us are interested in interesting men; and as Americans we never forget Frederick's admiration for Washington, or that when the Hessian hirelings were being shipped over here to fight us in the Revolution he refused their passage through his territory to a port of embarkation.

But I dwell thus here upon Frederick the Great because the present Berlin revolutionists when they chant their peans to "the Potsdam spirit" mean simply Frederick and the monarchs associated with the subjection of France in 1870. They are careful not to go back to Frederick's father, who was a royal monster. They also carefully omit Frederick's three successors, who were a poor lot. The first stole more territory from Poland with a meanness which his own Prussian people could not stomach; he was a bigot, and we recall that it was he who put a ban on Kant's religious writing. The second was in a measure redeemed to the intelligent mind by his noble wife, Queen Louise, and his noble minister, Stein; but when he was out from under the harrow he absolutely repudiated the pledges of constitutional reform which he had made to Stein in his day of need. The third is remembered by Americans as the king whose tyranny compelled the revolution of 1848 and the flight from Germany to America of the noble company of aspiring men like Carl Schurz, to whom we owe so much, following the liberty-loving Francis Lieber, who had similarly fled from similar tyranny under the previous reign. The panegyrists of "the Potsdam spirit" also skip the Emperor Frederick, most winning of all Hohenzollerns and a normal modern gentleman.

In a word, "the Potsdam spirit" means simply Frederick the Great, the Emperor William the First, and William the Second; and their one credential is the successful use of force and glorying in it. As men the two Kaisers were in no way imposing, in no way the equals of hundreds with whom they touched elbows. We like the simple, sturdy old Kaiser. The second William was the brainiest of the three Kaisers, the most versatile, the most appreciative of intellectual things, the best talker and the fondest of talking, and a vastly steadier and more devoted friend of peace than most of his detractors seem to know. But he was never so much in his element as when reviewing his troops and emitting martial rhetoric; and that is his chief credential with the devotees of "the Potsdam spirit." It was he who struck the deadly blow, when he dismissed Bismarck, to whom he and his whole house owed their fortune and their glory. Had he left him on the bridge as long as he chose to stay there, the world war would never have come; as it would

never have come if the military men in 1871 had heeded Bismarck's injunction that the taking of Alsace-Lorraine from France was not prudence or good strategy, but folly.

When the president of the new Reichstag, at the Hitler consecration ceremonies, proclaimed that "the spirit of Weimar is dead," he chose to ignore the history of the Weimar Constitution. It was a history which conferred honor upon the German people. The conditions could not have been more difficult. The ruling Hohenzollern had practically abdicated and run away. The idea of his recall was preposterous. The country would have risen in revolt. The responsible men in the reconstructed government acted soberly and with decision. Only a republican form was possible in the circumstances; and the resulting constitution, framed with remarkable soberness, patience and thoroughness, commands the respect of thoughtful students of history and government. It certainly cannot be said that it did not endue the chief executive with sufficient power; and its critics could hardly suggest a better constitution possible under the confused circumstances. The subsequent ills of Germany have not been due to the Weimar Constitution. They have been due to the treaty of Versailles and its abuses; and here is the source of Hitlerism.

EDWIN D. MEAD.

[*To be concluded*]

Jesus and Marx*

The Communist Manifesto, written in 1848, is the Magna Charta to millions of the workers of the world, who hold that man cannot be free until the workers own the instruments of production and manage their own industrial affairs. Marx is the champion in this document of what is called "historical materialism." This is why the pulpit is so quick to fly at him, as it did at Darwin, and declare him anti-religious, anti-God.

"A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of Communism"—so the Manifesto opens.

"Workmen of all countries unite!"—so the Manifesto closes.

There are two key-ideas in the Manifesto: *Communism,* a program for the world's social order; the *Solidarity of the Workers,* as necessary to the consummation of the program.

Let us examine the Manifesto,

"The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle." Marx is speaking as a historian. He was saying what Darwin was saying in biology. There is a universal struggle for existence—those best equipped with instruments of production survive.

Once, continues the Manifesto, it was the struggle between the free and and the slave, patrician and plebian, lord and serf; in a word, oppressor and oppressed. Everywhere in history is found a "graduation of social orders, patricians, knights, plebians, slaves." Modern society, "has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society," but has not done away with class antagonisms. Modern society has two great classes facing each other: Bourgeoisie, meaning modern capitalists, or owners of the means of production and employers of wage labor; "Proletarian," meaning "wage-laborers who have no means of production of their own, are reduced to selling their labor in order to live."

Society today is thus divided into two great camps —the Bourgeoisie—those who own the means of social production; and the proletariat—those who are wage-earners, without means of production except their labor. The contention of the Manifesto is, that Capitalism is, at last, failing to make good; it contains the seeds of its own death, and is "raising up its own grave diggers;" that the hope of the world is in the workers, who must unite and replace Capitalism with Communism—which allows no classes—even as Capitalism replaced Feudalism and Patriarchialism, that passed away each in its turn.

Marx does not attack the persons who are capitalists. He is only making a careful diagnosis of modern society. In fact, in the Manifesto he pronounces a eulogy on the achievements of capitalism. He says it has performed wonders, compared with the preceding systems. During its rule of one hundred years or more "it has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than all preceding generations together." It has led to an "epidemic of over-production." It has been one of the greatest of revolutionary agents, bringing forth revolutions in industry, commerce and morals in every decade. It has made expanding markets a necessity. It has been international.

Over against this capitalist class is rising another class, composed of wage-workers. The capitalist society will be replaced by all the workers uniting and acquiring the instruments of production, and thus organizing a democratic, industrial commonwealth, or communistic state, in which there shall be one class, namely workers. This will mean the disappearance of the capitalistic class—with the instruments of production in the hands of all.

Marx next proceeds to name certain definite steps which may be taken to reach the communistic social order—and one is amazed to see how far advanced (since 1848) society is on the way:

Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purpose. This should not startle us who are familiar with the state owning parks and forests and rivers and lakes and water frontage and roads and bridges and mines and railroads.

A heavy progressive income tax. Every nation has had an intimate acquaintance with the income tax during the past four years.

Abolition of all rights of inheritance.

Centralization of credit in the hands of the state.

Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the state.

Combination of agriculture with manufacturing.

Free education of all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labor in its present form.

Such a program as this should not startle intelligent people, especially since much of it has already been accomplished.

To bring about the transition from the bourgeois, or capitalist order, to the Communist order, in which

*Marx died fifty years ago, on March 14, 1883—Editor.

the instruments of production are in the hands of the proletariat—the workers—Marx proposes several definite things for which they should strive: to keep clearly in view the irrepressible conflict between bourgeoisie and proletariat; to keep the property question ever to the front; to secure union and agreement of the democratic parties of all countries; to openly declare that these ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions.

It is this last statement about the "forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions" that has awakened seven-eighths of the opposition to the Manifesto. Of this it should be fairly said that Marx is writing as a historian, and since all past changes have taken place only by force it would be natural to predict that the emancipation of the wage-workers could come about only by force. It should also be remembered that when he wrote, 1848, political power—by which revolutions are being wrought peaceably—had not come into the hands of the proletariat.

But if Marx definitely held, or if his followers hold, that the new social order can arrive only by force —it is at this point where Jesus and Marx separate. (It should be noted that probably as many "Christians" believe in force as do the disciples of Marx. I am keeping apart the content of the word "Jesus" and the word "Christian.")

To sum up: Marx's Manifesto contends that modern society, which is capitalistic in its structure, is undergoing a fast change, or revolution, toward a Communistic order of society; that this is being determined largely by economic forces; so that the history of civilization is that of a political and social order derived from an economic order. This transition from a bourgeoisie to a Communist order will be accomplished by force.

I proceed to speak of Marx and his Communist Manifesto in the light of Jesus.

They had many things in common—

Both believed in the principle of communism. Communism was the goal of social evolution that each saw. When Marx plodded away at his task in the midst of the poverty of East London—then, the most abject on earth—and felt as well as saw the dreadful fruit of capitalism, he was convinced that no social order was adequate, except an order in which there should be a community of interest and wealth. When Jesus looked out upon the world from Jerusalem and saw and felt the selfishness and cruelty of privilege, nothing could satisfy him but a society of brothers; and the first concrete act that his followers are recorded to have performed after his departure was to set up a type of communism.

Both were revolutionary as to bringing in the new order. That is, they insisted on its coming at once.

Both wrought to abolish antagonism within nations and between nations; to abolish class antagonisms. Nearly all institutions in Jesus' day—political, racial, social, industrial—thrived on antagonism. The same is true today. There is hardly an institution in a city or nation which does not gain the chief part of its substance from antagonisms. Churches even—Catholic, Protestant and all the varieties—are living on antagonisms. Men will spend millions to sustain an antagonism, where they will spend hundreds to conciliate. Marx pointed out that history in the past had been marked by class antagonisms; that there was a big one today; and that communism would abolish the class antagonism. . . Jesus claimed the same for his brotherhood, in which there was to be no bond nor free, Greek or Gentile or Jew—but all were to be one.

Both favored a radical rupture with traditional ideas of property. Jesus' ideas about property and rich men were so radical that the eyes of his followers fairly bulged when mentioned. Jesus went even farther than Marx in his demand that rich men should be eliminated from the social brotherhood—only Jesus wanted them to eliminate themselves.

Both wrought for a social order without classes, without orders. Jesus often rebuked his companions for eagerness for places, for prominence in acts of charity, etc.

What happened when those who believed in Jesus first got together in Jerusalem, and his spirit was fresh in their souls? They established a communist society in which they "had all things in common" . . . "neither was there any among them that lacked." What happened when the Pilgrims all alone on the shore of the Ocean, 3,000 miles from tradition and custom, they turned to the New Testament for directions in the establishing of a society. They became communists and had all things in common.

Jesus differs from Marx in several particulars.

He was more radical in demanding an inner communism. No external righteousness that might look good in the eyes of men would answer. Communism, described in Marx's Manifesto, which is developed out of material forces, will fail unless rooted in the hearts of men of faith.

Jesus emphasized *spiritual determinism,* while Marx emphasized *economic determinism.* Here is an apparent contradiction, as there is between the struggle for self and the struggle for others, between the centripetal and the centrifugal forces—but underneath there is harmony, though it may not be discernible: Marx is right when he attributes to economic determinism the major place in man's past development; but Jesus is right when he makes spiritual determinism—seeking first the realm of God—the supremacy of the human well linked with the will of God—the ultimate controlling power in human progress.

It is much as Henry Drummond years ago said about Darwin's law of the struggle for self being dominant. Mr. Drummond said, there is another law, obscure at first, but gaining strength with the ages, appearing conspicuously in mothers, apparently contrary to the first law; it is the law of *struggle for others.* This later law he held would one day become the supreme law, seen and understood by all.

Marx's law of *economic determinism* is like the law of *struggle for self*—it works and is powerful—so powerful as to seem at times to be all powerful; but Jesus' law of spiritual determinism is like the law of *struggle for others*—it is a growing child in the manger. Both laws are at work for the coming commonwealth.

Marx himself is a conspicuous example that economic conditions do not always determine. In East London, for twenty years, with economic conditions all adverse, he yet preserved a spiritual supremacy and idealism that nothing could destroy. In weakness, in trials, in sorrow, in poverty, in hostilities, in exile, in the midst of London's poorest, he yet kept a strong

spirit, and lived and worked as seeing Him who is invisible.

Jesus differs most from Marx in that he declared that the goal of social justice—that goal that both had in vision—was to be gained by the power of love. It must be admitted that love has not succeeded in establishing a social order, while force seems as yet to be the chief argument that the mass of men understand.

However, there are many signs that Jesus' method of bringing men into social justice by the power of love —the way to which he committed himself—is seen to be true; that spiritual elements are working within the economic and more and more getting the upper hand. It is beginning to be seen that social orders established by bayonets are on slipping sand, and produce their own grave-diggers.

Humanity is like a boy—in epitome. The boy has stomach and brain and will and conscience and heart. The only kind of social order thinkable for the boy is communism among his members. Mankind, like the boy, to possess peace and order, must have community of life.

But a boy's stomach does not determine his idea, his sociology—although undoubtedly playing a conspicuous part, especially in the first grades. More important grows the power of the brain, the will, the conscience, until it is found, as in Jesus, that the fundamental power is love; that the greatest power in the world is love. God is love.

As I think of Jesus and Marx in the same moment—it is impossible for me to consider them as antagonists. Real Christianity and real communism are not enemies. I feel certain that had Jesus visited Marx in his East London poverty, laboring on for years to find a way to lift burdens off the backs of men, Jesus would have been deeply moved as toward a fellow-worker. They would have understood each other, in their social visions, as both were familiar with the same visions of the Hebrew prophets. And, if Marx had touched the life of Jesus as he called the multitude to flee love of riches and seek the ways of justice and mercy, he would have wished that there were such leaders among the workers—men of similar spirit and personality.

SYDNEY STRONG.

The Study Table

New Books

The "Negro Year Book for 1931-32,"[1] is the eighth issue. It is a mine of information not only about the Negro in the United States, but in all the world. Naturally, the part treating of the Negro in the United States is the most extended, filling more than three-fifths of the pages. There are, however, parts devoted to the Negro in Latin America, the Negro in Europe and the Negro in Africa. Other parts are given over to the Negro in poetry and fine arts, literature upon the Negro, and lists of newspapers, agencies and organizations conducted by Negroes. The material comes from an enormous number of sources. There is little opportunity for literary style and the matters are so abundant and varied that they must be presented in the least possible space. Still it is a most interesting documentation and the editing is well done. So far as the United States is concerned there *is* advancement. Contact between white and black is locally developing greater sympathy. Groups are aiming at better understanding. It will be long before real justice will be shown to the Negro and race prejudice may, perhaps, never disappear, but the progress already made by the Negro under dreadful handicaps has been remarkable and his achievement will inevitably grow. If space permitted we would go into details. As it is, we will make but two quotations:

> On the whole, as we look back over the year, despite its poverty and suffering, its lynchings and continued race hate, we find abundant reason for encouragement; we have political power and we can use it. We have one member of Congress and after reapportionment we are going to have more members. We are securing wider recognitions in music, drama, art and literature. The area of human and social contact between the races in the United States is broadening and the question of our civil rights and economic concern to the nation. Therein lies abundant hope.

It is the N. A. A. C. P. (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) that speaks. The crime record is improving. It was always an unjust and unequally weighted record, but it is getting nearer to the normal. It is a judge in South Carolina who says:

> It used to be that almost every person brought into the court was a Negro. Now, it is just the other way around, the Whites in the court are numerous and the Negroes are scarce. The Negro race is trying to better itself. Around every little cabin in the country flowers have been planted and the place cleaned up. I wonder sometimes that colored people are not ashamed to appear in the same court with so many low down white persons.

We would like to quote of the remarkable achievement in education, in art, in letters; to speak of Liberian conditions; to tell of Cuba, where American whites are responsible for a growing ugly prejudice based on color. But you may read of these and a thousand more things in this book. There is surely no source book of more importance for white Americans and the extremely cheap price puts it within reach of all.

A written constitution must in time be outgrown. Social, economic and political changes are constantly occurring and new situations call for new treatment. Only a dead nation could be permanently held by such a document, no matter how wisely drawn up. That there are already nineteen amendments to our own venerable constitution is evidence of the truth of the statement. Anyone who thinks must know that much in our present day life and law is out of harmony with the Constitution. Many writers have deplored the fact and most of them demand a return to the letter and spirit of the old paper. Not so with the author of "Our Obsolete Constitution."[2] For him "the core of our present economic and political difficulties is the Constitution itself." That being so, he would have a Constituent Convention called and a new constitution adopted, which shall view things from the new, the social, the industrial point of view. Mere amendments will not meet the need. Unless the thing is done, soon and well, we must expect a violent revolution. Mr. Wallace presents his argument forcibly. Our Constitution was based upon individualism; it "was conceived

1. "Negro Year Book." An Annual Encyclopedia of the Negro. 1931-1932. Monroe N. Work, editor. Tuskegee Institute. 1932. Negro Year Book Publishing Company. 8 vo. pp. xiv. 544. Price $2.60.

2. "Our Obsolete Constitution." William Kay Wallace. New York: 1932. John Day Co. 16 mo. pp. 226. Price $2.00.

as a bulwark of the individual against the government;" it guaranteed the individual in his property, his person and his privilege of expression. Our author claims that:

1. Individual rights and immunities based on natural laws are no longer of paramount importance. 2. A social contract based on an alleged inherent antagonism between the governing and the governed, which is the cornerstone of our present instrument of government, is a fiction. 3. A geographical national state system is no longer vital in present-day social life.

These are principles; as to facts, he claims:

First, the individual has been stripped of his defenses against the encroachment of government. Second, Constitutional immunities are no longer valid. Third, our Government has in principle become autocratic. Fourth, the Constitution is obsolete.

He believes that changes have already gone so far that no violent transition is necessary; to recognize and accept things as they are will be a long step toward the achievement. A combination of "Scientific Capitalism" and "Scientific Socialism" (both capitalized) will meet the need. Industrial organization, the methods of big business, give us the pattern. "Efficiency" (blessed word) is the aim. The thing seems simple. The things to be guaranteed in the new Constitution—replacing the individual liberty of life, property and expression—are economic liberty, social security, more efficient government, personal liberty (in a social, non-individualistic sense), property (in its new concept), planned national economy. "How to achieve them with the least dislocation of our present social organization is the problem that confronts us."

From time to time we have noticed volumes of the series of *Government Handbooks,* appearing under the general editorship of Professors David P. Barrows and Thomas H. Reed. They are handy volumes, simply written by authorities, intended for text books in colleges and universities. They are equally suited to general reading. There has been a considerable interruption in the series but a new and timely volume on the "Government and Politics of Italy,"[3] by Henry Russell Spencer has now appeared. Prof. Spencer naturally devotes the greater part of his book to Fascism. The book just noticed is by one who has also made a special study of Italy and written upon its solution, when Constitutionalism broke down there. It is surely not a misrepresentation of both authors to state that they realize that constitutionalism has broken down and that we may perhaps learn something from Italy. Just now, we see the word *Technocracy* in the newspapers. It needs definition and clarification, but many seem to think it is the next and inevitable step in our own advancement. I do not remember that Wallace uses the word, but the idea seems to approximate to his proposed solution and surely Mussolini is putting a good deal of technocracy into action. Reform toward business efficiency, Fascism and Technocracy seem to be trends in one direction. Coming specifically to Italy, there has never been a natural and strong development of constitutionalism and parliamentary ideas there, as there has been in England. The geography of the peninsula caused the evolution of several quite different and separated local governments. When, only a few years ago, united Italy rose, a governmental pattern was borrowed, which was alien and never struck deep root. More than that the existence of the States of the Church presented a special and difficult problem. It has then not been strange that English constitutional ideas readily gave way in the face of serious difficulties. Fascism has been a natural attempt at solution. Our author makes no attempt to write a history of Italy's long past. He sketches a background of geography, people, history, church, and political parties, all in less than fifty years. The rest of his book deals with the past few years and the immediate present. He shows how Fascism began, how it has developed, how it is organized. He then presents in detail the governmental organization of today, gives a fair and interesting statement of the question between State and Church, and considers the external relations of Mussolini's Italy. Fascism has in some ways had phenomenal success; Spencer feels that its future is uncertain. Everyone must wonder—after Mussolini what? There is no reason to assume a real return to things as they were. The alien, borrowed plan of a parliamentary, constitutional government did not meet the need. Nor is it likely to do so in the future.

We have already called attention to Book One of "Directed High School History Study."[4] Having then vented whatever spleen we had upon it, we will now but congratulate the authors upon having so well carried their work through to its end. The present book begins with the French Revolution and comes down to the present—even including such recent material as Fascist Italy, Soviet Russia and the Lausanne Conference. Fair consideration is given to Latin America, China and Japan. None of them have the space it deserves, but all are usually actually neglected and it is encouraging to find them at all recognized in a high school text book. The methods are the same as those of the earlier book and are calculated to develop interest, thought and judgment. We repeat what we said before—that the student who adequately carries through the work here planned, will not only have a good foundation in history, but will have a book that he can keep with pride after his school days are past.

Huntington and Cushing's "Business Geography"[5] has had an encouraging reception. The "eleventh large printing, revised, with new statistics" has come to our table. It is a handsome book, well planned and well carried out. It is intended for seventh, eighth and ninth year classes, following earlier elementary work. It aims to stimulate to independent thought and expression by a system of problems, questions and exercises. The material is presented under four headings—primary production, transportation, manufacturing, consumption. In space, the first of these is equal almost to the other three together. We feel the book rather over-emphasizes American leadership and superiority. There are occasional apparent paradoxes or fallacies. Thus, after being drilled to the idea that railroad development is related to "highly progressive people" and to "densely populated countries," it comes as a shock to learn from the table that the highest railroad mileage in the United States is in Texas and the lowest is in Rhode Island. Is "high railroad mileage" just the term to use, anyway, in the table in which this fact emerges? The idea that railroad mileage may be overdone and that there may be areas (even in the United

3. "Government and Politics of Italy." Henry Russell Spencer. Yonkers-on-Hudson: 1932. World Book Co. 16 mo. pp. xii. 307. Price $1.60.

4. "Directed High School History Study, Book Two." Alice Magenis and Madeline F. Gilmour. Yonkers-on-Hudson: 1932. World Book Co. 8 vo. pp. 189-392. Price $0.84.

5. "Modern Business Geography." Ellsworth Huntington and Sumner W. Cushing. Yonkers-on-Hudson: 1932. World Book Co. 8 vo. pp. viii. 352. Price $1.96.

States) where a recession in railroad mileage may take place is not hinted. However it would be hypercriticism to lay stress upon occasional small lapses, where the general purpose and plan are so excellent and so admirably carried out.

A satisfactory little book is Prescott Thorp's "How to Build a Stamp Collection."[6] Its most extended appeal will be to the young and it is written so that the boy of ten or twelve will understand it, but it may well be read by those of maturer years. In fact, it will be surprising if it does not inveigle many an adult reader, who opens it with the idea that it is just the book to give John or Henry, to read it for himself and to be started on the philatelic career. The day has long gone by when one can hope to collect all the stamps there are. The tendency is more and more to limit one's field and to collect special series, which for one reason or another may amuse, interest or instruct. The author knows his field well, being connected with the famous Scott's company and editing their monthly journal. The book meets its title. There are twenty-one brief, pointed and helpful chapters. It introduces one into the field. It defines just those terms which one constantly meets and does not quite understand. It tells how one begins, and how he may go on. It is practical. How to start a collection, How to mount stamps, How to measure perforations, How to see watermarks—such are some of the chapters. There are ample illustrations.

FREDERICK STARR.

6. "How to Build a Stamp Collection." Prescott Thorp. New York: 1932. John Day Co. 16 mo. pp. xii. 113. Price $1.50.

An American Warlord

Precisely at the moment that martyred France turns Turpin and militarist Germany goes Gandhi, pacific America is confronted with the ominous specter of her first great champion of physical force. Evoked by the rolling hexameters of Lloyd Lewis's homespun epic,[7] Sherman comes galloping across its pages to the accompaniment of his own infernal diapason; and, amid the martial pageantry of a second American revolution, he who declared that war is hell most assuredly acts it.

The resurrection is in the flesh and infinite in detail: the energetic youth of this future Attila; his devastating West Point days; his rosebud romance and mating; his temporary business imbroglios; his pallid part in the Mexican War; his sojourn in the South on the very eve of its Armageddon; and then—the colossal catastrophe that throned him in the saddle and gave him sway over the forces of destruction surging southwards to level an ancient chivalry with the dust. Throughout all this panoply runs a minute spectrum of Sherman's character: and his inner as well as his outer life stands revealed. *In toto* we are familiarized with this picturesque amalgam of Napoleon and Ford, Cromwell and Hamlet, Socrates and Buffalo Bill—and, long after *finis*, wonder holds us that a thing so intrinsically odious as war can be made, at a distance and in the hands of a master, as marvelous as a Marlowesque melodrama.

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

7. "Sherman, Fighting Prophet." By Lloyd Lewis. Published by Harcourt, Brace and Company. $3.50.

Correspondence

Secretaries of the Navy and Disarmament

Editor of UNITY:

Two sudden performances, involving the outgoing and the incoming secretaries of the navy, are startling enough, as revelations of menacing undercurrents, to prompt sober citizens to sit up and take notice.

1. There is a strong move among the big navy men in New York and Washington to make Charles Francis Adams, the head of the navy department in the Hoover administration, president of the Navy league, superseding the notorious William Howard Gardiner, who got the league into such bad repute two years ago by his violent and boorish attack upon President Hoover.

2. Claude Swanson, who has been made secretary of the navy in the Roosevelt cabinet, inaugurates his work by announcing that he will endeavor to bring the fighting fleet up to the full strength permitted by the terms of the London treaty of 1930, and thus as soon as conditions make it possible, bringing our navy to equality with that of Great Britain. Mr. Swanson knows, of course, as well as you or I that this "permission," abstractly quite correct, in the London treaty involved no obligation or plan for any immense building up of our navy.

Why do the group of directors of the Navy league want Mr. Adams to head their organization? Manifestly because they feel that his activities and attitude while head of the navy department show him to be "their man." One does not need to belong to the Navy league for that assurance. It has been clear that the spirit and the policy of President Hoover and of Secretary Adams about a big navy and the general question of the reduction of armaments were growing steadily farther apart. The Navy league has become convinced that Mr. Adams's aims and ambitions for the navy are practically the same as its own.

The directors who have revolted against Mr. Gardiner's continued presidency had no objection to his general policy and program; they objected to his rampant and abusive pamphleteering and bad manners. Many of them are men of social standing; and the Gardiner sort of thing was indigestible at club dinners. They felt that Mr. Adams's style is more suitable for their purpose, and that in the point of a big navy he is just as solid as the offensive Mr. Gardiner. The point of moment for the common man is the revelation of the insidious counteractions which a President has to encounter in an effort to place the nation at the head of a great international crusade for disarmament.

The case of Mr. Swanson is worse than that of Mr. Adams; for Mr. Swanson has been a member of our American delegation at the Geneva disarmament conference, itself, and it was commonly expected until he was suddenly transferred from the Senate to the navy department that he was going back to Geneva when the conference reassembled. What he did while at the conference that was significant or bold few of us can recall; but we assumed that the President's stirring proposal to the conference, that all the nations should begin by cutting down their armaments one-third, was a peculiar inspiration and imperative for the American delegates at the conference to take advanced leadership in the cause that brought the conference together.

When Mr. Swanson urges our building up our navy to "parity" with Great Britain, it is well to remind him that even Theodore Roosevelt and Captain Mahan declared that we had no warrant or excuse for so large a navy as Great Britain; the latter's situation being vastly more exposed than ours, her possessions being scattered all over the world, and she being dependent for her daily bread upon safe and open sea routes. Moreover, we are not subject like the nations in the League of Nations to international regulation, and to that extent are more irresponsible, uncontrolled by the joint rules of the Covenant.

That an American delegate to the conference should make his first conspicuous act after his return from Geneva a plea for a bigger American navy is a mournful certificate of how sentimental and skin-deep had been his assumption of devotion to disarmament and his arraignment of the war system in behalf of international law and order.

We may never forget, nor allow our responsible rep-

resentatives to forget, that it was through our sponsorship that the nations have with practical unanimity adopted the pact renouncing war and pledging the settlement of all disputes by peaceful means. The provision for such legal settlement is now so complete as to meet every possible case; and failure in such recourse is recreancy and a reversion to the old anarchy which will no more be sanctioned. The Stimson declaration that this government will now recognize no acquisition of territory by force was but the direct and imperative implementing of this international pact.

For Americans of all men, and especially for official Americans, at such a juncture, to prate about the prestige of big navies or condone apologies for armaments is to sell our birthright and betray mankind.

Boston, Massachusetts. BRADLEY STONE.

A National Financial and Industrial Emergency

Editor of UNITY:

The consensus of opinion of social scientists is that a complete reconstruction of our present economic system upon a fundamentally different base is imperative. In making the change, "we face, as a condition of life, a major operation," a major financial operation. To have this operation performed scientifically and skilfully, under sanitary conditions by regularly constituted methods and carefully selected officials, would surely be a much saner and safer way than to trust it to illy prepared, hunger-goaded revolutionists. The method of operation depends upon the amount of convincive argument and appeal brought to bear upon Congress and the President. Thousands, millions of appeals, with reasons given, should be sent the President and members of Congress, urging them to declare the Existence of a National Financial and Industrial Emergency, and to enact measures necessary in meeting the situation.

The first of these measures might well be one patterned largely after the Selective Service Act of 1917 but calling only for forced selection of property to be used in overcoming this emergency, but with compensation to be on par with or slightly above compensations to the World War veterans and their dependents. All property other than *bona fide* personal effects, homesteads and furnishings, individually owned and used industrial property and collectively owned and cooperatively used property, to be selected for public use for a period of not less than 99 years and as much longer as the democracy of that future date may decide upon.

The selected industrial property to be utilized by the workers of the nation upon equal terms! Each individual worker to receive his or her total industrial output, minus an upkeep and amortization levy. The amortization levy to extend over a period of not less than 33 years without interest charge, and upon a sum equal only to the human energy cost of the structure. The amortization levy to be used in caring for the outgoing members of society. The selected investment property to be used in financing public enterprises including entertainment, education, sanitation and housing.

Amongst the reorganization measures should be one creating a Department of Industry with authority to direct in a major way the whole industrial process. There should be another measure creating a Department of Financial Relations designed to take over and operate as co-ordinate institutions the U. S. Treasury Department, the Postal Savings Banks, the R. F. C., the Land Banks, the National Banks, the Federal Reserve Banks and all non-mutual Investment and Insurance corporations.

In order to facilitate production and exchange the coinage laws should be amended by fixing the price of all other staple commodities even as they now fix the price of gold bullion. The prices of the other commodities should be fixed at par with gold, to be determined by (ascertained) relative amounts of human energy expended in their production. Privilege should be extended to all producers of all staple commodities to place their products in custody of the Treasurer of the U. S. and to receive in lieu thereof Treasury Certificates of Deposit, legal tender in payment of all debts public and private; the Certificates to be redeemable in any commodity in custody of the Treasurer. All other money except fractional currency should be retired.

Money alone should be subject to taxation in meeting governmental expenses. Tax collection to be effected by discounting Certificates of Deposit when presented to Treasurer for redemption. Date and monthly rate of discount to be printed on face of all Certificates of Deposit.

W. P. CALKINS.

Montebello, California.

The Hitler Horror

(1)

In Germany

There was a man of Galilee
  Who sought our world once more,
Hearing his people's forlorn plea
  Sob from the German shore.

"Let rancor perish from the earth!
  Let hatred fade!" He said.
"For all enjoy a common birth,
  And taste a common bread!"

But Hitler, stalking bloody-crowned
  Where battered thousands sighed,
Proclaimed, "Another Hebrew hound!"
  And had him crucified.

STANTON A. COBLENTZ.

(2)

Again the Dark Ages

Land of Heine and Mendelssohn,
We see you stagger, we hear you groan
Beneath the Nazis' trampling feet
That clang on every bloody street.

Oh, land that gave an Einstein birth
With vision that shall redeem the earth,
Wipe out this medieval shame:
The blasphemy in Hitler's name!

Oh, land of Goethe, Wagner, Kant,
How long shall vicious bigots rant
And your new banner stay unfurled
As Pilate-nation of the world?

LUCIA TRENT.

(3)

Defeat the Hitlers Everywhere!

My temples throb, my muscles tense
And down comes all the thin defense
My heart has built from gangs of hate
That storm the spirit's inner gate.
The brutes have waked the caveman-sense
One's love must be as God's immense
To live toward those who violate
All ways of bringing kinder fate.

Eternal shame to Fascist fist!
Italian, Indian, German, resist!
Let all the world come take the part
Of those who suffer wrong and smart
And let there everywhere be hissed
The heels that trample, claws that twist.
But let more love, not fury, start.
Oh, crush the Hitler within each heart!

For hate will reap what hatred sows.
It builds revenge and breeds its foes.
Though Hitler brings Dark Ages back,
Through British sabres foully hack,
Let us, protesting, still oppose
Within our land the Nazi blows,
Within our state a union-jack,
Within our hearts a fascist lack
Of love to thwart the maniac!

RALPH CHEYNEY.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 150)

supremacy in the Pacific. The markets of India are being tightened against Japanese competition by a rising tariff, based on imperial preference, in an effort to save from ruin the well-watered capital of Lancashire.

Japanese imperialism, therefore, aims at carving out a vast empire on the Asiatic mainland, where the mineral wealth of Manchuria offers boundless prospects. Across northern Manchuria (which Japan has included in her puppet state of Manchukuo) runs the Chinese Eastern Railway, connecting up the interior of Siberia with the ice-free port of Vladivostock. Built in Czarist days, this railway is the one link between the eastern Soviets and their only Pacific outlet: without it the U. S. S. R. would be deprived of all access to the ocean except through its western harbors on the Baltic and the Black Sea. While American imperialism watches apprehensively across the Pacific Ocean, and there concentrates its naval strength for the coming clash with Japan, Russia too is mobilizing to defend herself against the Japanese aggression that has already been threatened in more than words.

The position of the British government in this crisis is more involved than would at first appear. Ever since the Allies abandoned the "Open Door" policy in China (whereby the exploitation of China had been shared by the imperialist powers with a jealous regard for equality in dividing the spoils) we have backed Japan. By secret treaties we gave her the German Far Eastern concessions as the price of her assistance in the war, confirming these treaties with solemn pomp at Versailles. With loans and armaments to both Japan and China the western capitalists have used the subsequent struggle to enrich themselves in the years since the war, without any interference from their governments. By persistent obstruction at Geneva Sir John Simon has prevented any united front of western imperialism against Japan.

Then comes something like a *volte-face* in British policy: the unanimous report of the Committee of Nineteen at Geneva and the British Arms Embargo. Possibly Lord Lytton's policy prevailed, based (as he himself has told us) on the fear that China would otherwise be driven out of the arms of Geneva into those of Moscow, and the Soviet block strengthened. But possibly also Sir John Simon's task was already accomplished—the encouragement given to Japan which has strengthened her most aggressive elements, and committed her policy far enough to insure the war with Russia. This done, and Japan supplied with sufficient arms for the struggle, the British diplomats now wash their hands of the matter and leave the arena. I believe their real purpose can only be explained on this assumption, for we must remember that British imperialism has *two* enemies in the Far East—Communism and the imperialism of Japan. If these two could be made to destroy one another, China could be shared up as before (or more intensively) between the Western Powers, and the Indian market secured for the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, etc., against Japanese competition.

When we have grasped these facts it becomes clear—if it was not so before—that the British workers must not be duped into "backing the government" (or the League) even in measures that may be (or may appear to be) directed against Japanese imperialism. That is the fallacy with which they were duped in 1914, when British and German workers were each called upon to fight against the imperialism of the "enemy country"—and incidentally for the interests of their own imperialists! Workers' actions must be taken independently of *all* imperialist governments and *against* all such governments, on an international scale and regardless of so-called "national" interests. Probably the only effective action in England (at the moment when this goes to press) is the effort to organize the maximum stoppage of war supplies.

The larger issue is the attack on imperialism itself. Modern "finance imperialism" involving the exploitation of coolie labor (such as Britain maintains in the colonies) is a specially vulnerable point of attack when the competition of this coolie labor is driving down wages and increasing unemployment in our own country. This new imperialism has divided up almost the whole of South America between British and United States' investors, who intervene either through their governments or by supplying arms to their own puppets when their tribute is threatened. The radicals have yet to realize with what huge outside interests our economic life is connected, *for a Socialist government would have to forego this portion of "national wealth" before it began to redistribute the remainder.* No greater task lies before the socialist propagandist than the eradication of the "South African" fallacy—the attempt to achieve the emancipation of white labor by pooling the spoils of the colored serfs.

A revolutionary program in Britain must put the following among its immediate objects when power is in the workers' hands:

(1) *Complete independence* for all subject races and the dissolution of the Empire.

(2) *Cancellation of all unearned income* from abroad, involving a necessary repudiation of our own national debt.

(3) *Military evacuation* of India and the colonies and of all fortified outposts such as Gibraltar, with immediate naval disarmament. (We shall have nothing left to "defend"!)

(4) *All possible assistance to the workers and peasants* in the former colonies, to help them to take advantage of the situation as rapidly as they can and form Workers' and Peasants' Republics.

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS.

London, England.

La Follette's
Great National Weekly Newspaper
THE PROGRESSIVE

In every issue it is fighting your battles against monopoly and organized wealth in government

SPECIAL OFFER
4 Months
— 21 — ISSUES 50c

STARTLING facts suppressed by other papers will be revealed in the next few issues. Send 50 cents today and be sure to receive the next extraordinarily interesting issues of La Follette's great weekly newspaper.
The Progressive, Dept. B., Madison, Wis.

New and Revised Edition

INDIA IN BONDAGE

by JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND, M. A., D. D.

Brought Strictly Up-to-Date—8 New Chapters on

The Momentous Events of the Last Two Years in England and India—India's Future—Will Gandhi Win?—Will There be a Bloody Revolution?—Is the New Constitution which Britain is Forging for India, a CHARTER OF FREEDOM, or a STEEL FRAME OR STRONGER BONDAGE?

$2.00 at All Bookstores or Direct from

LEWIS COPELAND COMPANY, 570 Lexington Ave., New York

Help India's struggle for freedom by non-violence! Help us offset British propaganda and meet Gandhi's request for moral support from America.

Join the American League for India's Freedom, John Haynes Holmes, chairman.

Tear off and return:

American League for India's Freedom
183 Bible House
New York City

Count me in as a supporter of India's struggle for independence. Here are my membership dues $.....

Name .....

Date .....Address.....